REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-47 were originally submitted.

Claim 10 is canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1-9, 11-47 remain in this application.

Claims 48, 49 and 50 are added.

Examiner Interview

Telephonic interviews took place between Examiner Boris Pesin and Emmanuel Rivera. From the last telephone interview of May 23, 2006, the claims as currently amended are believed to overcome the previous cited reference of Ahead Software's Nero program (Nero). Applicant appreciates Examiner's Pesin resolving the proposed claim amendments and the review of the specification.

Response To Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment

The Office Communication presents that the response filed on January 26, 2007 to be not fully responsive to the Office Action, because the Applicant does not discuss the prior art cited and how the amended claims overcome that art.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the last Office Action, claims 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41, 43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahead Software's Nero program (Nero) in view of U.S. Patent 5,113,517 to Beard et al (Beard). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims.

Independent claim 17 is amended and recites "[a] graphical user interface for a computer, comprising:

an operating system that interacts with a user to manage computer resources;

the operating system having a resource browser that is responsive to user input to explore resource areas containing different types of resources and to display icons that represent the resources, at least some of the resources being physically moveable to and from the resource areas by moving their corresponding icons;

at least one of the resource areas being a staged-write resource area; and

in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user.

In particular, the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently

visible to the user" which is not taught by the primary reference of Nero. Nero teaches a staging area that is always available to the user. In other words, whatever target staging areas in which to transfer files are made available to the user. The amendment finds support in the specification in the description of Fig. 4, and particularly on page 13, lines 1-3. Beard is cited for teaching a user interface; however, in Beard does not teach the elements of "presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 25 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 25 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 27 is amended to recite in part "[a] graphical user interface for a computer, comprising: an operating system that interacts with a user to manage computer resources".

As discussed above, the cited references of Nero and Beard fail to teach or suggest this element. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 27 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 29, 30, 31, 33 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 29, 30, 31 and 33 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 41 is amended and recites "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

As discussed above, the cited references of Nero and Beard fail to teach or suggest this element. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 41 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 43, 45 and 50 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 41. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 43, 45 and 50 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,277 to Kuroda et al (Kuroda). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims.

Independent claim 1 is amended and recites "[o]ne or more computer readable media containing one or more operating system programs that comprise a resource browser, said one or more programs comprising computer-readable instructions for performing a process comprising:

interacting with a user to manage computer resources, including graphically browsing different computer resource areas that contain resources managed by the operating system;

representing resources within the resource areas as icons, the resources being physically moveable to and from at least some of the resource areas by moving the icons;

at least one of the resource areas being a particular type of writable resource area to which resources can be written; and

in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user.

In particular, claim 1 has been amended to the element "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". As discussed above , this element is not taught by the primary reference of Nero. Kuroda is cited as teaching "include the ability to hold off on recording data until the eject button is pressed with the motivation to reduce the speed of the total recording time because the data would only be recorded once and not several times". However, Kuroda fails to teach "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 48 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 48 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 35 recites in part "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

As discussed above, the cited references of Nero and Kuroda fail to teach or suggest this element. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 36, 37, 38, 40 and 48 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 36, 37, 38, 40 and 48 be withdrawn.

In the interviews discussed above, it was discussed that the Nero reference does not teach the element of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Independent claims 1, 12, 17, 27, 35, 41, and 46 have been amended to include this element. Therefore, the independent claims and their dependent claims are allowable over the cited reference of Nero.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 28, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Beard and in further view of Kuroda. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims.

Independent claim 12 recites in part "presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". As discussed above, this element is not taught by the primary reference of Nero. Furthermore, the reference of Beard and Kuroda do not teach this element. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 13, 15 and 16 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 12. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 13, 15 and 16 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 18 depends from claim 17 and benefits from the benefits from the arguments in support of claim 17 as to Nero and Beard. In particular, claim 18 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero and Beard to

teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Kuroda is cited as teaching "when the ejection operation to eject the recording disk to the outside is performed, the file management data pieces recorded on a predetermined area of the recording disk". However, Kuroda again does not teach element of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 28 depends from claim 27 and benefits from the benefits from the arguments in support of claim 27 as to Nero and Beard. In particular, claim 28 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero and Beard to teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Kuroda is cited as teaching "when the ejection operation to eject the recording disk to the outside is performed, the file management data pieces recorded on a predetermined area of the recording disk". However, Kuroda again does not teach element of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 28 be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of U.S. Patent 6,499,095 to Sexton et al (Sexton). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim.

Dependent claim 9 depends from claim 1 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 1 as to Nero and Kuroda. In particular, claim 9 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero and Kuroda to teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Sexton is cited as teaching "a numeric reference employs a machine-independent format for encoding references between objects that is suitable for both run-time use in virtual machines and storage use in secondary storage". However, Sexton does not teach elements of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Accordingly, none of the three cited references suggest including the recited features as elements of an operating system. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,277 to Stewart (Stewart). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims.

Dependent claim 11 depends from claim 1 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 1 as to Nero and Kuroda.

The combination of Nero, Kuroda, and Stewart fail to teach or suggest the graphical user interface of claim 11. In particular, claim 11 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero and Kuroda to teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Stewart is cited for its teaching of a "locking mechanism with the motivation to provide the user with protection of writing over an undesired file". Stewart does not teach elements of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Accordingly, none of the three cited references suggest including the recited element of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user features". Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 39 depends from claim 35 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 35 as to Nero and Kuroda. In particular, claim 39 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero and Kuroda to teach "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Stewart is cited as teaching "to produce the shared files using some conventional operating systems, including a filename or other identifier with which to name the file. The operating system may create the file and open it. Additionally, the operating system may lock the file in response to such a command in order to prohibit use of the file by other processes while the file is being written. The writer may receive from some conventional operating systems a pointer or other identifier of the file in response to the open for write command." Stewart provides no assistance in light of Nero and Kuroda as to the recited computer readable media of claim 39. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 39 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of U.S Patent 6,678,764 to Paravelescu et al (Paravelescu). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 14.

Dependent claim 14 depends from claim 12 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 12 as to Nero and Kuroda. In particular, claim 14 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero and Kuroda to teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Paravelescu is cited as teaching "if media is not present, a beep or other warning and prompt to the user to insert media is issued". However, Paravelescu provides no suggestion as to an operating system. Therefore, the combination of these three references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 24 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Sexton. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 24 and 32.

Dependent claim 24 depends from claim 17, and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 17 as to Nero. In particular, claim 24 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero to teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Sexton is cited as teaching "a numeric reference employs a machine-independent format for encoding references between objects that is suitable for both run-time use in virtual machines and storage use in secondary storage".

However, Sexton does not teach elements of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 32 depends from claim 27 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 27 as to Nero. In particular, claim 32 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero to teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Sexton is cited as teaching "a numeric reference employs a machine-independent format for encoding references between objects that is suitable for both run-time use in virtual machines and storage use in secondary storage". However, Sexton does not teach elements of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

Claims 26, 34 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of Beard, and in further view of Stewart. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims.

Dependent claim 26 depends from claim 17 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 17 as to Nero and Beard. In particular, claim 26 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero and Beard to teach or

suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Stewart is cited as teaching "to produce the shared file using some conventional operating systems, the write sends an 'open for write' commence to the operating system, including a filename or other identifier with which to name the file. The operating system may create the file and open it. Additionally, the operating system may lock the file in response to such a command in order to prohibit use of the file by other processes while the file is being written. The writer may receive from some conventional operating systems a pointer or other identifier of the file in response to the open for write command". However, Stewart does not teach elements of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 34 depends from claim 27 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 27 as to Nero and Beard. In particular, claim 26 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero and Beard to teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Stewart is cited for the same teaching as used in rejecting claim 24. However, Stewart provides no suggestion of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Therefore, the combination of these references, even

combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 34 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 44 depends from claim 41 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 41 as to Nero. In particular, claim 44 benefits from arguments directed to the failure of Nero to teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

Stewart is cited for the same teaching as used in rejecting claim 24. However, Stewart provides no suggestion of "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 44 be withdrawn.

Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of Sexton, in further view of Stewart, and in further view of Kuroda. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 46 and 47.

Independent claim 46 in part recites "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user".

As discussed above, Nero does not teach or suggest "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Furthermore, Sexton, Stewart, and Kuroda do not teach or suggest such an element.

Sexton is cited as teaching "storing corresponding references to the designated resources". Stewart is cited as teaching "for any designated resource

that is changed prior to writing, creating an unchanged copy of the staged resource and changing the corresponding reference to indicate the unchanged copy". Kuroda is cited as teaching "in response to an instruction to write to the removable storage medium, writing any designated resources and any unchanged copies indicated by the stored references". However, Sexton, Stewart, and Kuroda provide no suggestion as to "in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user". Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 46 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 47 is allowable by virtue of its dependency on base claim 46. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 47 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-9, 11-50 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: <u>May 2, 2007</u>   By: <u>/Emmanuel A. Rivera/</u>
                                       Emmanuel A. Rivera
                                       Reg. No. 45,760
                                       (509) 324-9256 ext. 245